REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9-57, 60-100, 102-150 and 153-186 are pending in the application. Of those, claims 16-26, 38-52, 63-93, 109-119, 131-145 and 156-186 were withdrawn as being directed to a non-elected invention. Claims 8, 58, 59, 101, 151, and 152 were previously canceled without prejudice. Claims 1, 27, 53, 94, 120, and 146 are amended to more clearly state each claim. New claims 187-192 are added. The amendments are supported at least at page 7, line 1 through page 8, line 20 of the Application as originally filed. No new matter is added by the amendments.

Claims 1-11, 14, 15, 94-104, 107, and 108 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stautner et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,172,677 (hereinafter "Stautner") in view of Farris et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,881,131 (hereinafter "Farris"). Claims 13 and 106 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stautner and Farris, and further in view of Alexander et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,177,931 (hereinafter "Alexander"). Claims 12 and 105 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stautner and Farris, and further in view of Dillon et al. U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0059526 (hereinafter "Dillon"). Claims 27-33 and 120-126 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stautner in view of Farris and Scharber et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,374,290 (hereinafter "Scharber") and Humes U.S. Patent No. 5,996,011 (hereinafter "Humes"). Claims 34, 35, 37, 127, 128, and 130 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stautner, Farris, and Humes, and further in view of Cirasole et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,987,606 (hereinafter "Cirasole"). Claims 36 and 129 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stautner, Farris, Scharber, Humes, and Cirasole, and further in view of Dillon. Claims 53-57, 60-62, 146-150, and 153-155 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander in view of Farris.

Reconsideration of this application in light of the following remarks is hereby respectfully requested.

Stautner et al. and Farris et al., either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest cross-referencing a newsgroup listing to an aspect of a program listing

The Examiner asserts that base claims 1 and 94 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Stautner et al. in view of Farris et al. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The display shown by Stautner et al. in Fig. 2 clearly lacks any reference to, teaching, or suggestion of a newsgroup listing. Because Stautner et al. are neither interested in nor disclose a newsgroup listing, Stautner et al. clearly cannot teach or suggest having "at least one newsgroup listing cross-referenced to an aspect of the program listing" as recited in base claims 1 and 94. At best, Stautner et al. disclose providing a link to a chat session for a particular show (See Stautner et al., Fig. 2 and col. 6, lines 25-50) which is very different than cross-referencing a program with one or more newsgroup listings based on an aspect of the program. Furthermore, Farris et al. fail to make up for lack of teaching in Stautner et al. Farris et al. simply disclose how USENET newsgroups may be used over the Internet. Thus, Stautner et al. and Farris et al., either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of amended base claims 1 and 94. Therefore, there is no prima facie case of obviousness and the §103 Rejection of base claims 1 and 94 should be withdrawn.

Because claims 2-11, 14, 15, 95-104, 107, and 108 depend from, and are limited by, base claims 1 and 94, the §103 Rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

Claims 13 and 106 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stautner et al. and Farris et al., and further in view of Alexander et al. Because Alexander et al. fail to make up for the lack of teaching in Stautner et al. and Farris et al. as discussed above, there is no prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claims 13 and 106. Therefore, the §103 Rejection of claims 13 and 106 should be withdrawn.

Claims 12 and 105 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stautner et al. and Farris et al., and further in view of Dillon et al. Because Dillon et al. fail to make up for the lack of teaching in Stautner et al. and Farris et al. as discussed above, there is no prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claims 12 and 105. Therefore, the §103 Rejection of claims 12 and 105 should be withdrawn.

Claims 27-33 and 120-126 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stautner et al. in view of Farris et al. and Scharber et al. and Humes. Base claims 27 and 120 have been amended to more clearly indicate "at least one newsgroup message being cross-

referenced by the interactive television application to an aspect of at least one program listing," While the scope of base claims 27 and 120 is different than base claim 1, because Scharber et al. and Humes fail to make up for the lack of teaching in Stautner et al. and Farris et al. as discussed above with respect to claim 1, there is no prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claims 27-33 and 120-126. Therefore, the §103 Rejection of claims 27-33 and 120-126 should be withdrawn.

Claims 34, 35, 37, 127, 128, and 130 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stautner et al., Farris et al., and Humes, and further in view of Cirasole et al. Because Cirasole et al. fail to make up for the lack of teaching in Stautner et al., Farris et al. and Humes as discussed above, there is no prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claims 34, 35, 37, 127, 128, and 130. Therefore, the §103 Rejection of claims 34, 35, 37, 127, 128, and 130 should be withdrawn.

Claims 36 and 129 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stautner et al., Farris et al., Scharber et al., Humes, and Cirasole et al., and further in view of Dillon. In view of the above discussion, there is no prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claims 36 and 129. Therefore, the §103 Rejection of claims 36 and 129 should be withdrawn.

Alexander et al. and Farris et al., either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest cross-referencing a newsgroup listing to an aspect of television programming

Claims 53-57, 60-62, 146-150, and 153-155 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander et al. in view of Farris et al. However, Alexander et al. and Farris et al., either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest that "the subject matter of the newsgroup content is cross-referenced to an aspect of the television programming" as recited in base claims 53 and 146. Thus, there is no prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claims 53-57, 60-62, 146-150, and 153-155 and the §103 Rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, remarks and discussion, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

We believe that we have appropriately provided for fees due in connection with this submission. However, if there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this Response, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-1945, under Order No. UV-154 (003597-0154) from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: May 15, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Christopher P. Carroll
Registration No.: 55,776
FISH & NEAVE IP GROUP, ROPES & GRAY LLP
One International Place
Boston, Massachusetts 02110-2624
(617) 951-7000
(617) 951-7050 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant